

U.S. Application No. 10/502,117  
Reply to Office Action of April 2, 2007  
Amendment dated: October 2, 2007

### **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the prior art rejections set forth by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. sections 102 and 103. Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art references of record, whether considered alone, or in combination, fail to either teach or suggest Applicant's presently claimed invention. More specifically, Applicant's presently claimed invention is directed to an improved high-frequency circuit module including a wiring pattern formed in an organic insulative layer and including a plurality of conductive parts forming passive elements. Independent claim 1 specifies that each of the conductive parts are formed in a region corresponding to an area of the organic insulative layer where no woven glass fiber fabric is provided.

The Examiner makes the unsupported assertion that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of the Kubota reference in conjunction with the Kobayashi reference to render the claims invalid as being obvious. The Examiner recognizes the deficiencies of the Kubota reference at least to the extent that there is no organic insulative layer formed from polyimide material. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have a polyamide layer as taught by Kobayashi in the high-frequency module of Kubota. Significantly, however, there is no teaching or suggestion whatsoever regarding the purported combination and furthermore, there is no indication as to why certain regions would not have woven glass fiber which as noted in the specification, causes inconsistent performance when the fiber is laid across or beneath the conductive parts.

Accordingly, in light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-3 is improper and should be withdrawn.

U.S. Application No. 10/502,117  
Reply to Office Action of April 2, 2007  
Amendment dated: October 2, 2007

In regard to the rejections set forth in Paragraph 3 of the Examiner's action, Significantly, there is no teaching or suggestion whatsoever regarding the purported combination as claimed and furthermore, there is no indication as to why certain regions of the specified device would not have woven glass fiber which as noted in the specification, causes inconsistent performance when the fiber is laid across or beneath the conductive parts.

Accordingly, in light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejection of claims 5-6, 8-9, 11-12 and 14 is improper and should be withdrawn.

In regard to the Examiner's rejection of claims 16-19 as being obvious in light of the combined teachings of the Geller reference in view of Kobayashi and the admitted prior art of Figure 5, Applicant notes that even the Examiner recognizes that the Geller reference even if considered to be modified by the teachings of the Kobayashi fails to teach or suggest the specified woven glass fiber of the claimed invention. The Examiner makes the unsupported assertion that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the glass fiber as specified in the claims. However, there is no teaching or suggestion regarding the selective application of the woven glass fiber as specified. Accordingly, in light of foregoing, Applicants submit that the Examiner's rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

U.S. Application No. 10/502,117  
Reply to Office Action of April 2, 2007  
Amendment dated: October 2, 2007

In light of foregoing, Applicant submits that all claims now stand in condition for allowance.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date:

10/2/07

(Reg. #37,607)

Robert J. Depke

**ROCKEY, DEPKE, LYONS, LLC**

Sears Tower, Suite 5450

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6306

Tel: (312) 277-2006

**Attorneys for Applicant**